

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2 and 5 are amended to distinguish over JP '447. Claims 13-15 are canceled.

No new matter is added by this Amendment. Support for the language added to claims 1, 2 and 5 can be found in claims 13, 14 and 15, respectively.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (as the amendments incorporate previously considered claims); (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

I. Objection to the Disclosure

The disclosure was objected as allegedly including informalities. In particular, the Patent Office requests that all trademarks be capitalized. Accordingly, Applicants have capitalized trademarks where located.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are thus respectfully requested.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Patent Office alleges that the originally filed specification does not disclose that at least one of Ar¹ to Ar⁵ is bonded to R¹. Instead, the specification allegedly only discloses that at least one of Ar¹ to Ar⁵ has a bonding hand to R¹. The Patent Office further alleges that "a bonding hand" is not a common term. Applicants respectfully disagree with these assertions.

Applicants submit that it is clearly understandable from the disclosure of the original specification that the term "a bonding hand" means "is bonded to." This meaning of "a bonding hand" is particularly clear when considering that Ar¹ through Ar⁵ in Formula (4) have a portion, i.e., a hand, that bonds to R¹ in Formula (2), i.e., a "bonding hand" between Ar¹ through Ar⁵ in Formula (4) and R¹ in Formula (2). To clarify this relationship, Applicants previously amended claim 3 in the response to the prior Office Action.

Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art understands that the term "bonding hand" means "is bonded to," especially in Japan. See, for example, paragraph 9 of JP 10-168447 A, paragraph 59 of JP 11-255716 A and paragraph 32 of JP 2003-286234 A, referring to bonding, or joint, hands with respect to a bonding relationship.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 3 is supported by the original specification. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-3 and 5-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004-0086794 ("Yamada"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Filed herewith is a verified translation of the priority document which confirms the right of the claims to the March 24, 2003 priority date. As a result, Yamada, filed August 27, 2003, is not available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by JP 2001-100447 ("JP '447").

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by JP '447. Each of these separate rejections relying upon JP '447 are respectfully traversed.

Applicants point out that claims 13, 14 and 15 have been incorporated into claims 1, 5 and 7, respectively. As acknowledged by the Patent Office, JP '447 does not teach or suggest the limitations recited in claims 13-15 and now recited in claims 1, 5 and 7.

Furthermore, when the Y group is a divalent group as recited in claims 1, 5 and 7, moderate flexibility is imparted to the resulting siloxane resin to improve the strength of the layer. JP '447 does not teach or suggest this feature.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that JP '447 does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claims 1-3 and 5-12. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are thus respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3 and 5-12 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Leana Levin

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Leana Levin
Registration No. 51,939

JAO:LL/hs

Attachment:
Verified translation of priority document

Date: July 26, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--